

Serial No. **10/539,762**
Amdt. dated March 2, 2009
Reply to Office Action of October 29, 2008

Docket No. **HI-0189**

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 30-61 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 30-35, 37-49, 51-53, 55, and 57-61 are amended. No new matter is added. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. In particular, the Examiner is directed to page 11, lines 8-15, and page 14, lines 14-20, of the present application. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 30, 37-38, 44, and 58 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is already directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 30, 37-38, 44, and 58 have been amended to address the Examiner's comments. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 30-34 and 38-43 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserted that "[i]t is unclear to the [E]xaminer exactly what the [A]pplicant is trying to claim," referring to the features in claims 30 and 38 of "a word parser that separates a token on the basis of markup and non-markup by referring to a token table for all markup data necessary for a kind of document to be supported..." and "each different token is generated by a corresponding parser." The Examiner further stated that:

The same string of the web document **has** a different token depending on whether it is a markup or a non-markup. Then each different token is **generated**

by a corresponding parser. The word parser separates a token it has for a document based on markup or non-markup. The token being generated “each different token” **is the same** as the token that is already in the document “same string of the web document has a different token.”

However, the Examiner is directed, for example, to Figure 4 of the present application and the corresponding disclosure, in particular to page 7, line 31, to page 8, line 21, of the present application and page 10, lines 1-16. Referring, for example, to the exemplary embodiment shown in Figure 4, the word parser 310 separates a token on the basis of markup and non-markup by referring to a token table 311 for all markup data necessary for a kind of document to be supported. Each different token is generated by a corresponding parser. A same string, such as HTML, of the document has a different token according to whether it is a markup or a non-markup in contrast to a general programming language. In response to the Examiner’s comments, claims 30 and 38 have been amended to improve their clarity. In particular, the phrase “wherein a same string of the web document provided to the terminal has a different token depending on whether it is a markup or a non-markup” is intended to further limit the phrase “wherein each different token is generated by a corresponding parser.” Accordingly, the rejection of claims 30-34 and 38-43 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 30-34, 38-54, and 57-60 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sahota et al. (hereinafter “Sahota”), U.S. Patent Publication No.

Serial No. **10/539,762**
Amtd. dated March 2, 2009
Reply to Office Action of October 29, 2008

Docket No. **HI-0189**

2001/0056460, in view of Mackie et al. (hereinafter "Mackie"), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0054535. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 30, 38, 44, 48-49, and 57-58 recite, *inter alia*, a syntax parser that performs a mapping operation so as to represent a GUI model of a specific markup language by GUI supported by the handheld terminal regardless of the specific markup language. Neither Sahota nor Mackie, taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest such features, or the respective claimed combinations of independent claims 30, 38, 44, 48-49, and 57-58.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 30, 38, 44, 48-49, and 57-58 over Sahota and Mackie should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 31-34, 39-43, 45-47, 50-54, and 59-60 are allowable over Sahota and Mackie at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 30, 38, 44, and 48-49, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejected claims 35-37, and 55-56 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sahota and Mackie, and further in view of Chadha et al. (hereinafter "Chadha"), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0184552. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 35, 37 and 55 recite, *inter alia*, wherein the element supported by a terminal for the called web-document is separated from the document by at least one of defining a token table on the basis of an element supported by the terminal and making the undefined token an UNKNOWN token, or ignoring the undefined token. Sahota, Mackie, and Chadha,

Serial No. **10/539,762**
Amdt. dated March 2, 2009
Reply to Office Action of October 29, 2008

Docket No. **HI-0189**

taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest such features, or the respective claimed combinations of independent claims 35, 37, and 55.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 35, 37, and 55 over Sahota, Mackie, and Chadha should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 36 and 56 are allowable over Sahota, Mackie, and Chadha at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 35 and 55, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejected claim 61 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sahota in view of Web Design Group comments. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claim 61 is allowable over Sahota at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 30, from which it depends, as well as for its added features. Further, the Web Design Group comments fail to overcome the deficiencies of Sahota, as it is merely cited for allegedly teaching the comments feature. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 61 over Sahota and the Web Design Group comments should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.


Serial No. **10/539,762**
Amdt. dated March 2, 2009
Reply to Office Action of October 29, 2008

Docket No. **HI-0189**

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Carol L. Druzbeck
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 CLD:pb:tlg

Date: March 2, 2009

\\Fk4\Documents\2019\2019-195\187010.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610